

Serial No. 09/910,061

PD-201093

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2007, which was made final, claims 1, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 32, 33, and 37 have been amended, and claims 11-13, 16-17, 21, 24, 29-31, and 34-35 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or surrender of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1-10, 14-15, 19-20, 22-23, 25-28, 32-33, and 37-46 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

II. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicant's attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

III. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In paragraph 15 of the Office Action of March 7, 2007, claims 13, 31, and 49 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Advisory Action of May 22, 2007, claim 19 was considered to require a new search because some of the intervening claims between claim 31 and independent claim 19 were not included in the previous amendment.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner in determining the allowable nature of claims 13, 31, and 49, and Applicant has made amendments in this response to bring claim 19 into accordance with the requirements of the Office Action.

Applicants have rewritten the claims of the present application to overcome the objections, and respectfully submit that all remaining claims are now in good order for allowance. Such amendments are not made for reasons of patentability, since the claims were allowable and not rejected, and are merely clarified in the rewriting of the claims in independent format.

Applicant respectfully traverses the arguments and objections presented in the Office Action and the Advisory Action, however, in light of the amendments made to the claims which adds

Serial No. 09/910,061

PD-201093

allowable subject matter to each of the remaining independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections are moot. Applicant's silence with respect to the rejections is not to be interpreted as acceptance of the rejections presented in the Office Action. Applicant reserves the right to file continuation applications to further clarify the claims over the cited art.

IV. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraphs (2)-(3) of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-9, 15, 16, 19-23, 26-27, 34, 37-41, and 44-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Amano et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,323,240 (Amano). In paragraphs (4)-(5) of the Office Action, claims 11 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Amano and Bedard, U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747. In paragraph (6) of the Office Action, claims 12 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Amano and Bedard and further in view of Candelore et al. (2002/0104081 A) (Candelore). In paragraph (7) of the Office Action, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano and Wugofski (2003/0056216). In paragraph (8) of the Office Action, claims 17 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano and Wugofski. In paragraph (9) of the Office Action, claims 7, 25, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano and Trovato et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,445,306, (Trovato). In paragraph (10) of the Office Action, claims 6, 24, 33, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano and White (2002/0056098). In paragraph (11) of the Office Action, claims 10, 28, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano and Bonomi et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,769,127, (Bonomi). In paragraph (12) of the Office Action, claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano, White, and Bedard. In paragraph (13) of the Office Action, claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano, White, Bedard, and further in view of Candelore. In paragraph (14) of the Office Action, claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Amano, White, and Wugofski.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, however, in light of the amendments made to the claims which adds allowable subject matter to each of the remaining independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot. Applicant's silence with respect to the rejections is not to be interpreted as acceptance of the rejections presented in the Office Action.

Serial No. 09/910,061

PD-201093

Applicant reserves the right to file continuation applications to further clarify the claims over the cited art.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 31, 2007

By: 

Name: Georgann S. Grunebach
Registration No.: 33,179

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
CA / LA1 / A109
2230 E. Imperial Highway
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

Telephone: 301-964-4615